

## REMARKS

1. Claims 16-23 and 46-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,504,053 to Chou et al (hereinafter "Chou et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Chou et al. relates to an improved silver-containing epoxidation catalyst comprising a manganese component. *U.S. Patent No. 5,504,053*, col. 8, ll. 24-33.

Chou et al. describes possible cation promoters for the catalyst as alkali metal and/or alkaline earth metals as well as Group 3b metal ions including scandium, yttrium, lanthanum and the lanthanide series metals. *Id.* at col. 15, ll. 30-36. The preferred amount of cation promoter deposited or present on the carrier is disclosed as in the range of from about 10 to 4000 parts per million by weight. *Id.* at col. 15, l. 66 – col. 16, l. 4. Chou et al. discloses that the ratio of cesium salt to any other alkali metal and alkaline earth metal salt(s), if used, is not critical and may vary over a wide range, for example cesium comprises at least about 10, more preferably about 20 to 100 % wt. of the total added alkali metal and alkaline earth metals. *Id.* at col. 16, ll. 6-15.

Further, the working examples of Chou et al. disclose various catalyst compositions; however, none of the examples appear to utilize a catalyst composition containing potassium and a Group IA metal having an atomic number of at least 37.


The Examiner asserts that the  $(Q_K / R) + Q_{HIA}$  limitation is disclosed in Chou et al. at column 15, line 63 to column 16, line 12. *Office action, mailed October 13, 2006*, page 3, first full paragraph. As discussed above, the referenced amounts at columns 15 – 16 are for the total amount of cation promoter which is deposited on or present on the surface of the support. Further, the cation promoters referenced in Chou et al. include alkali metal and/or alkaline earth metals as well as Group 3b metal ions including scandium, yttrium, lanthanum and the lanthanide series metals. Thus, the amounts disclosed for cation promoters include more than just alkali metal amounts. There is no generic disclosure regarding the amount of alkali metals deposited on or present on the surface of the support. The ratios of cesium salt referenced by the Examiner are ratios with respect to any other alkali metal and alkaline earth metal salt(s), if used. Further, the ratios are not considered critical and may vary over a wide range. Therefore, there is no direct and unambiguous disclosure in Chou et al. of depositing a Group IA metal having an atomic number of at least 37 and potassium in an amount satisfying the expression  $(Q_K / R) + Q_{HIA}$  in the range of from 1.5 to 30 mmole/kg and where the ratio of  $Q_{HIA}$  to  $Q_K$  is at least 1:1. Therefore, Chou et al. does not disclose each and every

limitation of claim 16. As claims 17-23 and 46-49 depend from claim 16, they are also not anticipated by Chou et al.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner would like to discuss this case with Applicants attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MAREK MATUSZ ET AL.

By 

Attorney, Craig M. Lundell  
Registration No. 30,284  
(713) 241-2475

P.O. Box 2463  
Houston, Texas 77252-2463